

RESPONSE TO Office Action
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/706,814

ART UNIT 2616
Q61285

REMARKS

I. Formal Matters.

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in this application.

As an initial matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited via the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 7, 2000, as evidenced by the return of an initialed Form PTO/SB/08 to the office of the undersigned.

II. 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10 and 14-16 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hamada* (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,347) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). The Examiner provides a detailed comparison of each of Applicant's claims, element by element, to the disclosure in *Hamada* citing to specific language within the reference. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 requires an audio/video producer for inserting the additional information supplied from the packet parser into a particular region in the audio and/or video packet supplied from the audio/video parser. The Examiner cites to *Hamada* at Fig. 6 alleging that "Fig. 6 shows additional information that can be added to the packet parser into a particular region" (OA page 3). The subject matter which the Examiner asserts is shown in Fig. 6 is distinguishable from the subject matter of claim 1 recited above. While Fig. 6 shows information "which can be added", Applicant claims inserting additional information into an audio/video packet. *Hamada* fails to

RESPONSE TO Office Action
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/706,814

ART UNIT 2616
Q61285

teach or suggest the insertion of additional information supplied from a packet parser into a particular region in an audio/video packet.

Fig. 6 shows a schematic diagram for explaining an extracting method for TS packets of a predetermined stream (col. 2, lines 59-60). Fig. 6 fails to disclose an audio/video producer for inserting additional information supplied from the packet parser into a particular region in the audio and/or video packet. *Hamada* references Fig. 6 and teaches a TS packet containing video data of a particular channel is assigned a unique PID corresponding thereto. Thus, to extract a TS packet of a desired channel, the value of the PID assigned to the packet is required. Consequently, a TS has a TS packet that contains additional information table PSI that represents the relation between channels and PIDs (col. 8, lines 8-14). Examples of PSI are PAT and PMT, shown in Fig. 6 (col. 8, lines 15-16). *Hamada* teaches that the Transport Stream, TS, comprised of TS packets (Fig. 5), where the TS packets already contain the PSI. *Hamada* fails to disclose inserting additional information supplied from the packet parser into an audio/video packet. *Hamada* teaches extracting a PID, but does not insert the PID into a packet (col. 9, lines 28-52).

Hamada, as asserted by the Examiner, extracts TS packets at which a PCR is placed. These TS packets have video data and audio data, and have a variety of control information with reference to PID contained in TS packets. However, as shown in Fig. 6 and described at col. 8, lines 3-39, Hamada teaches an extracting method for TS packets of a predetermined channel and does not describe the contents which are extracted. And further *Hamada* fails to teach or suggest "inserting the additional information into a particular region of the audio/video packet."

RESPONSE TO Office Action
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/706,814

ART UNIT 2616
Q61285

Therein *Hamada* fails to disclose an audio/video producer for inserting the additional information supplied from the packet parser into a particular region in the audio and/or video packet supplied from the audio/video parser. At least for this deficiency, the rejection of claim 1 as being unpatentable by *Hamada* under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 contains the subject matter of asserted as grounds for patentability in claim 1, above. An argument analogous to that presented above is hereby asserted in traversal of the rejection of claim 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claim 10 as being anticipated by *Hamada* under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) is deemed proper and is respectfully requested.

Claim 2. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is patentable by virtue of its dependence upon an allowable claim and by the following independent grounds. Applicant respectfully submits that *Hamada* fails to disclose "a plurality of table parsers for outputting additional information of the plurality of table packets", as required by claim 2. The Examiner asserts that *Hamada* discloses parsing of various information from a plurality of table packets (Examiner citing *Hamada* at Fig. 8 and col. 8; FOA page 4).

Hamada teaches a parser 74 (Fig. 8) which extracts a TS packet from the TS received from the PID extracting portion 71 corresponding to the match signal received from the comparing portion and supplies the extracted packet to terminal 63a (col. 9, lines 53-58). However, *Hamada* fails to disclose a parser which outputs additional information of the plurality of table packets. At least for this deficiency the rejection of claim 2 as being unpatentable by *Hamada* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO Office Action
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/706,814

ART UNIT 2616
Q61285

Claim 5. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentable by virtue of its dependence upon an allowable claim.

Claims 9, 14 and 16 contain the same subject matter, but depend from different independent claims. *Hamada* discloses, on the broadcast station side, “[i]n addition, the transmitting unit 1 forms a TS that contains digital data of a broadcast program and other necessary data...” (col. 3, lines 12-14).

In contrast, claim 9 requires the audio/video data storing apparatus of claim 1, wherein said additional information is image feature information such as a title, a classification code, a time, content information, energy information and motion information of a user desired program. Applicant limits additional information as listed above, while *Hamada* fails to further describe “necessary” data. *Hamada* fails to teach that parser 74 analyzes characteristics of energy, motion information, and so on. Thus, *Hamada* fails to disclose the subject matter of claims 9, 14 and 16. At least for this deficiency, the rejection of claims 9, 14, and 16 as being unpatentable by *Hamada* under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 requires, an additional information classifier for parsing the audio and or video packet supplied from the input portion and extracting and outputting the additional information, and then outputting the audio and/or video packet excepting for the additional information. The Examiner cites to Fig. 7, controller 14, as classifying the parsing of the audio video packets. Turning to col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 1, we find that *Hamada* discloses the structure of a

RESPONSE TO Office Action
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/706,814

ART UNIT 2616
Q61285

controller 14 in Fig. 7. Further, said controller comprises an interface bus, RAM, ROM and CPU. However, *Hamada* fails to teach a controller comprises or functions as an additional information classifier for parsing the audio and or video packet supplied from the input portion and extracting and outputting the additional information, and then outputting the audio and/or video packet excepting for the additional information. At least for this deficiency the rejection of claim 15 as being anticipated by *Hamada* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner rejects claims 3, 4, 6-8, 12 and 13 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Hamada* in view of *Oishi, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,195) ("*Oishi*") under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 3 requires an EIT parser for receiving the EIT packet from the NIT parser and outputting additional information. The Examiner acknowledges that *Hamada* fails to disclose an EIT parser for receiving the EIT packet from the NIT parser and outputting additional information. Therein, the Examiner relies on *Oishi* to teach this element, citing to *Oishi* at col. 6, lines 1-32 (OA page 8).

Applicant respectfully submits that *Oishi* teaches that NIT can be in table format, and such an NIT table format is shown in Fig. 7 (col. 5, lines 22-28). Two descriptors forming part of the NIT are described, a satellite delivery system descriptor (DVB) and a service list descriptor (col. 5, lines 33-35, lines 39-41, lines 49-55). *Oishi* goes on to teach that in addition to the two descriptors in NIT, information of Electronic Program Guide is arranged in the (EPG) in the

RESPONSE TO Office Action
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/706,814

ART UNIT 2616
Q61285

payload (data) area of the MPEG2 transport packet (col. 5, lines 62-64). EPG information is described in an SI, a section format table. Finally, a receiver extracts information from the section format table, which includes EIT, to display it on the display screen (col. 6, lines 3-9).

Oishi fails to teach or suggest receiving an EIT packet. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that an EIT could be transported as an individual packet, or within a larger packet. A packet is a small amount of computer data sent over a network. Each packet contains the address of its origin and destination, and information that connects it to the related packets being sent.¹ Packetization effects processing of the data. The combination of *Hamada* and *Oishi* fails to teach or suggest receiving an EIT packet. At least for this deficiency the rejection of claim 3 as being unpatentable over *Hamada* in view of *Oishi* under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 4. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependence upon an allowable claim.

Claims 7 and 12. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence upon an allowable claim.

Claims 8 and 13. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence upon an allowable claim.

¹ <http://www.sharpcned.net/glossary/definition.php?packet>

RESPONSE TO Office Action
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/706,814

ART UNIT 2616
Q61285

Claim 6. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependence upon an allowable claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Amelia F. Morani, Ph.D.
Amelia F. Morani, Ph.D.
Registration No. 52,049

Date: October 5, 2005

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 05 2005

FILING RECEIPT
PLEASE DATE STAMP AND RETURN TO US - BOX 235X

In re application of

Kang-wook CHUN

Appln. No.: 09/706,814

Group Art Unit: 2616

Confirmation No.: 5957

Examiner: Jamie J. Vent

Filed: November 7, 2000

For: APPARATUS FOR STORING AND SEARCHING AUDIO/VIDEO
DATA CONTAINING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

PAPER FILED ENTITLED:

1. Response to Office Action

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Faxsimile: (202) 293-7860

DOCKET NO.: Q61285

ATTORNEY/SEC: PAM:APM:lef

Date Filed: October 5, 2005

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER